



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

There was much that was admirable in the parade. The order, the discipline, the courtesies, the beauty of the movements of the big ships, the skilful manipulation of the flags, the fine uniforms flashing in the sunlight, the flying colors, the splendid columns of marching men, the stirring music. Even the most sincere peace man has hard work not to admire all this. In itself it is admirable, magnificent, like a display of meteors or comets or rainbows. It was the love of display and splendor that brought the great crowds on the shores to witness the scene. The papers are saying that it was the great interest felt in our new navy that called out the enthusiasm of the spectators. But probably not one in ten of them cared a farthing whether we have any navy or not. The taxpayers who were gathered there got their money's worth in show and glitter, and will probably grumble just as much as ever about taxes when they get home.

While all the pomp and splendor of this scene were going on, we had reflections. Why is it that only the war side of humanity, the art of killing and destruction, gets up such splendid demonstrations as this? Take off all this display and glitter and let the ghastly skeleton of war be seen in its reality, and not another army could ever be mustered on the field of battle.

These thirty-five floating fortifications cost at least fifty millions of dollars for their original construction. To build all of the war vessels of all classes now afloat could not have cost less than twenty times this sum, or one thousand millions of dollars. The annual outlay for keeping up all these war navies is at least one fourth of this sum and probably much more, or from two hundred and fifty to five hundred millions a year. What could not be done with these vast sums of money if turned into the channels of peace-making? Last year the Swiss government voted *three thousand francs* to aid the Peace Congress, and this year the Norwegian has voted the sum of *seven thousand* to aid the Inter-parliamentary Conference to be held this summer in Christiania. Those, so far as we know, are the first sums ever voted directly to support the peace movement.

Again, most of these thirty-five ships are under ten years old and some of them are already sufficiently antiquated to be useless in a time of actual warfare. Ten years more will put them all on the retired list, and new ones costing much more will take their places. The next hundred war vessels built will cost three hundred millions of dollars.

The remark made above about this demonstration being in some measure in the interests of peace was made in all sincerity. But while watching with a feeling of admiration the splendid water spectacle in New York harbor, one could not help thinking of something else. The reporters of the papers, as their sketches show, could not help comparing these ships one with another and guessing which would whip in actual fight.

The truth is they were made for fighting. Every feature in their construction was planned with that in view, and the pleasure in many a heart at sight of the splendor of the great parade must have been greatly spoiled at thought of the scenes of carnage and ruin through which these same ships and men may have to pass.

Why do such vessels exist? They were not made for show. Take off the covering of glitter and pomp and you find staring you in the face the national hatred and distrust which built every war ship on the sea. These

hatreds and suspicions are wicked and inhuman, and therefore such ships instead of standing for civilization and progress are but the outward symbols, decked out in modern finery, of that which is lowest and cruelest in human nature. Hatred, revenge, distrust! These are the words that ought to be written high up on the prows of them all.

In the case of our own navy, there is not the shadow of an excuse, outside of wholly unfounded fear, for adding another vessel to it. Every nation respects us. No nation is thinking of attacking us. The money spent on three million dollar battle-ships is absolutely wasted. Not even the magnificence of such a spectacle as that just witnessed can justify us in what we are doing. In this respect, instead of bringing up other nations to our own plane, we are going headlong down to theirs. For the sake of the superficial and ephemeral respect of nations essentially warlike, we are sacrificing a deeper and truer one inspired by our civil and religious freedom, a respect much more powerful for guarding our shores than all the armor-plated battle-ships that we can build. In some as yet unforeseen way we are sure to reap the fruits of this inexcusable folly. \*

#### THE COMING REFORM—A WOMAN'S WORD.

BY MARY ELIZABETH BLAKE OF BOSTON.

[Reprinted by request.]

It is strange what a hold old habits retain upon the world at large, although the circumstances which formed them may have entirely disappeared. Centuries ago the total absence of law, and the poor apology for order which existed among the governing forces of masses of men, rendered an appeal to arms the only solution possible in case of difficulties between individuals or nations. A blind feeling of reverence and trust in the divine power accompanied this attempt at settlement; so that, entering upon the battle, or the duel, with the conviction that God would aid the victim and confound the oppressor, it frequently resulted that right did make might, and that wrong was vanquished by justice. Our broader and sadder wisdom has laughed such faith to scorn; intricate relations between community and community, as well as complicated laws governing society, have increased a thousandfold the causes of quarrel and misconception; we have removed the duel from the pale of civilization and Christianity, and relegated all questions of dispute between man and man, whether civil or criminal, to the arbitration of courts or to the decision of a body of jurors. But we still have recourse to war as settlement of difficulty between nations; and the wickedness which we call murder in the singular becomes transformed to glory in the plural. We do this with open eyes, and unabashed; although we know but too well by bitter experience of life and the world, that the justice of a cause, or the honesty of a motive, count for less than nothing in determining the result, if the opposite side can produce more men and more money to equip them. What a sad commentary upon the state of public opinion, and upon the forces which rule the chances of defeat or success, is this sentence taken from an editorial of the *New York Sun* apropos of the question between the United States and Canada: "It is not the right or the wrong, the justice or injustice of a cause that determines these disputes among

nations; it is the caliber and range of the rifled guns, the thickness of the armor plating, the speed of the ships of war." To what base level has the moral nature sunk when we must consent to give up a cherished principle or to act as the ruffian who demands the same renunciation at the hands of another, according as our army is, or is not, upon a war footing. What, after all, is a war footing? Millions of men taken from honest toil and happy homes, and sweet life itself; millions of money diverted from useful industries and needed improvements and the thousand waiting paths of peace and progress; millions of acres of fruitful soil and mighty cities given up to wrath and desolation, to suffering of hunger and thirst and infernal torture of mind and body on the part of their inhabitants—and all for what? Not that justice may be done nor right avenged, since we have seen just now that neither of those factors count in the result; but that in the end, all this inhuman slaughter, all this agony and devastation, all this crying and mighty evil, shall go to prove which country has the longest purse and the most deadly rifles—a problem that could have been so readily and quietly settled without shot or groan.

#### THE THUNDER OF PUBLIC OPINION.

When we talk of the needs of humanity and try to unlock some of the thousand and one petty hindrances which close the doors of happiness and prosperity, why do we not first strive to gather together all strength, all aims, all energy, until mankind, in one unanimous thunder of public opinion, demands for itself release from this infernal and monstrous evil. Why do we not in the school and the college, in the workshop and the study, in the street and on the house-top, by the press and by the pulpit, teach, talk and preach until the irrational aspect of this subject of war shall become familiar to the world, which now accepts it almost unquestioningly. A few individuals here and there are doing noble work in pressing the claims of national arbitration upon the attention of mankind; but they are repelled by such a mass of indifference, of skepticism, and of interested opposition as makes their effort void. We of America are particularly fitted by natural position, and by happy circumstance, for this evangelical work. We are practically outside the pernicious pressure brought to bear upon the different nationalities of the Old World by political intrigue, by rivalry and by aggressive policies; and we can afford to champion the cause without fear or favor. It would be a holy and a glorious work, if only the inspiration of its necessity could be brought to spur our people into action upon it.

#### DOING EVIL THAT GOOD MAY COME.

Let me say a word more in relation to the desperate unreasonableness of war and its kindred methods as settlement of disputed questions. It has been stated that certain motives—first of all that of patriotism—hallow even warfare, and heighten every virtue of which men and nations are possessed. And this may be quite true without at all touching the merits of the question under consideration. The individual protecting his family and fireside from the attack of an assailant, or the patriot yielding fortune and life in defence of the liberty and principles of his country, are examples as purely heroic as the soul can conceive, and entitled to all honor and

glory. But how about the state of morality which sanctions private robbery and public misrule for the sake of calling out these noble attributes in humanity? Why should the hero be called to offer up an existence which should be source of prosperity and thanksgiving to his native land, in accordance with an unreasonable and inhuman policy, which subjects a question of abstract morality and justice to the variable decision of material force? Why should the sanctity with which the law hedges about the humblest home, offering its protection and security, be denied to the nobler proportions of the nation, which is left an open prey to the ambition or duplicity of its neighbors? If avarice, or covetousness, or cruelty, or revenge for some fancied wrong, pushes a fellow-man into open attempt to coerce your action or ravage your possessions, the Government places its power and its wealth at your command to repel and punish the offender by legal methods and penalties. But when the field of operations is enlarged, and the threat or the quarrel is between nations instead of individuals, there is no safeguard for law and order but the brutal and unjust exercise of force.

#### FRANCE AND GERMANY.

When Germany and France stood face to face, throwing all their magnificent resources of material and intellectual wealth into the hateful vindictiveness of passion and frenzied rivalry of force, what did they hope to gain in concession from one or both that might not have been better granted by yielding to the representation of wise and disinterested men, without the wicked fever of triumph on the one hand and the desolating humiliation of defeat on the other which has poisoned their mutual relationship ever since? Who pretends to believe—even to the most rabid upholder of the absolute necessity of war—that the Franco-Prussian disputes were in any degree more fairly and justly settled after the bloody struggle than before? One country, tortured and tormented, wounded to the bitter depths of her pride and self-respect, anguished by the overthrow of the results of her patient toil and magnificent intelligence through years of prosperity and peace, is forced to gather from the ruins of her overthrown grandeur some millions of tribute in sign of her degradation before her rival. The other, flushed with haughty triumph, buries the wounds she has received under this golden mantle of increased wealth and possessions, and looks about with increased eagerness and readiness for other fancied affronts, or possible perquisites. In the breast of each rankles that dark and deadly animosity which must ever be a barrier between conqueror and conquered. On the one hand suspicion, on the other hate, stand between helpfulness and common interest and brotherly love; no scheme of possible greatness or glory can stimulate victor or vanquished like that of urging again the hateful strife between retaliation and conceit.

#### PRIVATE AND PUBLIC WRONGS.

What would we think of private difficulties settled upon the same principle? One man thinks another has wronged him in violating the terms of an agreement, in marking the boundaries of his domain, in maligning him before his fellows, in cheating him of just dues, in interfering in any way with his rights of property or person. Does he resort to fisticuffs or revolvers? Does he institute a siege of his neighbor's premises, or attempt the abduction of

his neighbor's person, or right himself in turn by the larceny of his neighbor's purse? No, for the sentiment of the world denies that any such measure is proper or adequate for the balancing of right or wrong. So far from having in any way assisted the efforts of justice or vindicated his cause, the second man, no matter how just his complaint, or how arbitrary the injury under which he suffered, would have laid himself liable to punishment and loss of personal liberty, in the interests of society and the State. How then can the State ignore for herself the argument which she so wisely and logically applies to the separated interests of her sons? Can she allow that specious reasoning which makes the greater evil less vicious than the smaller; and which grades the judgment upon guilt in inverse proportion to its magnitude? That would be giving point to the sneer which dubs the impoverished stealer of a dollar a thief, while the wealthy robber of thousands is only a respectable defaulter. That would be ordaining the gallows as the penalty for one life taken in a street brawl, and showering honor and glory as reward for battlefields gory with heaps of slain, and pallid with dying lips crying to heaven in agony. Alas! and alas! Is not this just what we are doing — just what we must continue to do if we close our eyes to this lurid and hideous cloud which still hides from us the sun of righteousness and the gospel of the Prince of Peace?

#### NATIONS IN CONCERT.

It is quite evident that in attempting the overthrow of this mighty evil only concerted action can be of any avail. It is utterly impossible that one nation should begin to reduce its armaments while others preserve their standing armies and their belief in appeals to brute force and the lower passions in man. Surrounded by watchful eyes and grasping desires, each country must supply itself with the means of preserving its integrity of action and hold itself ready to repel either coercion or invasion. But concerted action can only be the result of individual thought and judgment. Each person must reach for himself the ultimate and abstract merit of arbitration as opposed to force in the settlement of national difficulties before he can become a strength to the cause he desires to champion, and an apostle for the speeding of such doctrines among his fellows. It is in this way that every poor and weak word, spoken in honesty of conviction from one heart to another, carries some weight with it; and that the discussion of such a tremendous question becomes allowable to us all.

#### THE DUTY OF CONGRESS.

There are at present — in some great waste basket made to receive the cast-aside papers which do not get acted upon — ten bills introduced into the Congress of the United States in order to give legal sanction to this most important movement. For some reason they have never been taken up in an active spirit of inquiry into their merits, or fairly discussed. Yet if the august Senators and Representatives, upon whose shoulders rest the weight of State affairs, only knew it, there would be more honor, more usefulness and more claim upon the gratitude and homage of posterity in the pushing forward of this great scheme of civilization than in all the petty details that concern distribution of patronage, abuses of local government, or even the convenient disposition of the surplus revenue.

For here is a question which concerns all nations and all people. Here is a study which has to do with untold wealth, with gigantic interests, with the demands of enlightenment and progress, and with the common heart of humanity. Other considerations may be of local importance. The care of manufactures in the East and productions in the West; a fishery question at the North, and an educational bill at the South, may each have important claims upon time and attention; but a measure which has to deal with the life or death of millions of men, with the diversion into channels of prosperity and improvement of billions of money now wasted in accomplishing ruin and devastation, is of more consequence than all the others put together.

#### THE VERDICT OF HISTORY.

I sometimes wonder if, when we in turn have become a thing of the past, and taken our place under the investigating lens of the future antiquary, this impenetrable blindness of ours in regard to the wickedness of war, and the utter absurdity of applying to it the principles of justice, will not be the greatest stumbling block in forming a critical analysis of our character. Many precious impulses toward right, many heroic efforts in the way of helpfulness and uplifting of our race, much deep and earnest thought upon every matter appertaining to purer and higher life — mentally, at least, if not morally — he must certainly admit for us who would fairly judge our progress and civilization. He would no doubt praise the efforts we are making to raise the standard of intelligence among the common people; and the discrimination which is leading us to combat such vices as intemperance by training the youthful mind into a healthful understanding of its inherent wrongfulness. He would admire our widespread schemes of benevolence and philanthropy, and place it to our credit, that in this latter half of the nineteenth century we had begun to notice the claims of the heathen and the savage at our gates, as well as of those further away.

He will look with delight upon the strides we have made in reducing the strain of physical labor for the working-man, and upon the series of brilliant experiments which have brought electricity and a score of other hitherto unknown forces into the realms of natural law. But he would stand dismayed before the idiosyncrasy which could permit an intelligence so widespread and benign to tolerate the same *barbarism of warfare* which disfigured the first century and the tenth and the sombre days of the middle ages. He would pause in the sure verdict of high enlightenment and noble achievement which otherwise would stand as the exponent of our age, and strive to find theories and possibilities which should account for this conflict between absurdity and common sense. "So full of sense," he would groan, "and so amenable to law and order in their private relations; so exact in the attempt to render justice in case of petty disputes and trifling quarrels; so anxious to imbue the minds of their children with clear ideas of right and wrong and with the necessity of combating evil by principle instead of force! And yet flying to Krupp cannon and rifled guns in cases of national dispute; bankrupting their treasuries and taxing their inhabitants for the means of wholesale slaughter among those very masses; offering inducements to superior talent to buoy itself upon the discovery of more terrible explosives and more deadly engines for destroying life — and doing all this in the name of Order

and Humanity! Ach" (for of course our philosophic archæologist would be a German), "Ach! was für ein Volk!" Going over the future page with him, I also am constrained to exclaim, "*Oh, what a people!*"

#### DUELLING AND WAR.

As a curious commentary upon the general subject of war came the paper in Harper's Magazine for March, 1887, entitled "Duelling in Paris." Entirely to my amazement, and I am quite sure equally to the surprise of a large proportion of its readers, the article showed that the duel, both in theory and practice, was at that late date the orthodox method for settling disputes among cultivated Frenchmen. "Never has the rapier been held in higher honor in France than at the present day, and perhaps never since the times of Richelieu and the Fronde has duelling been more common." Recent events show that this is still true in 1893.

We rejoice to hear of its decadence in the German Universities, but it has not lost its hold on fashionable society in the German empire.

But the men of France and Germany at least have the courage of their convictions. They carry their belief in an appeal to arms as a necessity in the settlement of human affairs from high to low, through all the varieties of case and number. They apply the principle in a general way, and appeal to the same tribunal for the arrangement of individual as for complex difficulties. There is no break in their logic. It starts from an absolutely false principle, but we must do them the justice of confessing that they maintain the same false principle throughout. They do not attempt to serve a certain purpose by leaving their first premises in the lurch and adopting a wholly opposite line of argument. It is we, Americans and English, who are guilty of this moral perversion. We despise the duel. We ignore it utterly as a standard for the regulation of dispute or the righting of wrong. We sneer, from our loftier conception of reason, at the primitive and untrained intelligence which can see use or cause for such a blot upon civilization in the nineteenth century. And then, still sustained by the heroic sense of superiority, we calmly turn about and make our preparations for the greatest duel of all; — a duel of hundreds of thousands instead of single men; — and we proceed to burn, to kill, to destroy, by every art which the ingenuity of the intellect can devise and the skill of the hand accomplish. We maim and blight thousands of lives instead of one; we cripple the resources of a nation instead of a household; we bring despair and rebellion into whole communities of men — and we carry away just as much triumph, as much reward of conscience and as much vindication of right, victor or vanquished, as the two men from their duelling field. Yet we look down upon our fiery French brother because he happens to be more logical than ourselves! "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." Who was it that spoke of straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel? I would like to commend that little sentence to the profound attention of every man who is tempted to turn from the article in Harper's — and who will not be? — with an emotion of self-satisfaction and serene congratulation that we are not like unto those French and German publicans, who offend our finer sensibilities by such absurdities against common sense.

#### SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FRIENDS OF RUSSIAN FREEDOM.

##### *Protest Against the Russian Extradition Treaty.*

The Executive Committee of the Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom wish to enter their solemn protest against the consummation of the treaty which is now under consideration at Washington between the United States government and the Russian autocracy. The terms of this treaty are still officially withheld from the American people; but uncontradicted rumors declare that it includes an extradition clause by which any person accused by the Russian autocracy of an attempt, from whatever motive, upon the life of the Czar or other member of the royal family, and taking refuge in this country, shall be returned by our authorities to be dealt with according to Russian practices. This treaty compromises the moral attitude of the American people.

Our protest is made upon no basis of approval of assassination as a right or wise method in revolution. It is based on the fact that, however wrong such a method may be, men have been driven to its use by the still greater wrongs inflicted by the Russian autocracy on the Russian people. These men, however their acts and methods may be deplored, are not ordinary criminals, but are strictly what, it is understood, this treaty declares them not to be, — political offenders; and we object to delivering up any political offenders to the Russian autocracy, because that autocracy has shown itself to be morally irresponsible in its treatment of political offenders, and inhuman in its conduct toward political thinkers who would not be considered offenders in any country governed by constitutional and civilized methods.

The Russian who strikes at the Czar commits a crime against a person in behalf of a people. The Russian autocracy commits crimes against a whole people in the interests of a person, a family and an official class. We earnestly protest against the surrender of the lesser to the greater offender against the forms, the order and the moral sentiment of modern civilization.

It is unworthy of the government and the people of the United States to aid in the barbarous practices of the Russian autocracy, which we maintain to be morally incompetent to try the Revolutionists whom its own despotism has created. This treaty is a treaty not with a people, but with a class.

We protest, because jury trial is now almost unknown in Russia in political cases.

We protest, because it would be impossible for our local courts, upon whom would fall the responsibility of extradition, to weigh the evidence in such cases, by reason of the wide difference between Russian and American views of what constitutes implication in guilt. This difference is strikingly shown by Sect. 242 of the Russian criminal law, which runs as follows:

"The ill contrivement (against the life or person or dignity of the Lord and Emperor) is regarded as an accomplished crime, not only in case an attempt has already been made by the wrong-doer to put his criminal intentions into operation, but also as soon as he has started any preparations whatever for this purpose, either by urging another person to take part in those intentions, or by plotting a conspiracy or starting a secret society for that end, or by joining such a society or conspiracy, or